

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

@___

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/677,225	10/03/2003	Oren Sapir	935.43189X00	8599	
20457 A NTONEL L I	7590 01/04/2008 TERRY STOLIT & KRA	EXAMINER			
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873			SIEFKE, SAMUEL P		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Michigron	, 111 22207 3073		1797		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/04/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

·		Application N	lo.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/677,225	SAPIR ET AL.						
		Examiner		Art Unit					
		Samuel P. Sie	efke	1797					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the co	ver sheet with the co	orrespondence ad	dress				
Period fo									
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS 1.136(a). In no event, h od will apply and will exp tute, cause the application	COMMUNICATION nowever, may a reply be time or SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONED	l. ely filed the mailing date of this co) (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status					•				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25	October 2007.							
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
	closed in accordance with the practice under	r Ex parte Quayl	э, 1935 С.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.	•				
Dispositi	ion of Claims		•		• .				
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.								
· ·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.								
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requ	irement.						
Applicati	ion Papers								
9)	The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.							
10)	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note	the attached Office	Action or form PT	O-152.				
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•							
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
a)	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
• 6	application from the International Bure	·		_					
- 8	See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ist of the certified	copies not receive	a.					
		•	•						
•									
Attachmen			□ <u>-</u>	(DTO 145)					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	. 4)	Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
3) 🔲 Infoл	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		Notice of Informal Pa		·				

10/677,225 Art Unit: 1797

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Application/Control Number:

10/677,225 Art Unit: 1797

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0169057 (herein after Ep '057) in view of Jenkins et al. (USPN 6,642,513).

Ep '057 teaches a method for detecting contraband substances that comprises the following steps, placing a container (smaller containers) in a closed space (large cargo container) and sampling the air within the cargo container with a filter by sucking air past the filter (page 4), the filter is then removed and the filter is heated to vaporize the particles contained on the filter and then the vapors are analyzed in a mass analyzer (abstract, page 2, lines 14-19, page 3, lines 4-12). The method is designed to detect traces of solid particles (explosive, dynamite, PETN, TNT, narcotics, heroin, cocaine, cannabis, marijuana) (page 7, 8 and table 1). The filter is a wire mesh coil that can be heated to vaporize the solid particles (page 17). The air stream 71 in the line 48 enters the center of the coil 70 and travels radially there through as indicated by arrows 72 (much like an automobile air filter). This statement meets all the limitations of the newly amended claim 1 the filter it is open at one opening where air flow 71 enters then exits through the filter and not through the back side of the filter which is closed.

Ep '057 does not teach a filter that comprises a woven fabric or a non-woven fabric.

Jenkins teaches materials for the detection of contraband that comprises filters that are made of woven fabric, non-woven fabrics and fabrics made of plastic materials. (col. 2, line 59 –col. 3,line 17). Jenkins states that the fabrics are made of high temperature fibers which allows for rapid heating to temperatures exceeding 200 degrees Celsius. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill

Application/Control Number:

10/677,225 Art Unit: 1797

in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ep '057 to employ the fabrics of Jenkins because it is well known in the art that specific fabrics are capable of being heated to high temperatures thereby vaporizing any solid substances trapped therein which allows for vapor detection of the sample.

Regarding claim, it is well known in the art that animals, i.e. dogs, are specifically trained to smell and detect traces of contraband. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ep '057 to employ an animal sniffing the filter to determine if any contraband is on the filter because it is well known that animals can detect contraband.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel P. Siefke whose telephone number is 571-272-1262. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on 571-272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:

10/677,225 Art Unit: 1797

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sam P. Siefke

January 3, 2008